



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

File

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,894	02/01/2001	Haim Weissman	010077	8144
23696	7590	10/07/2005		
Qualcomm, NC			EXAMINER	
5775 Morehouse Drive			SOBUTKA, PHILIP	
San Diego, CA 92121				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2684	

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/775,894	WEISSMAN, HAIM
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Philip J. Sobotka	2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-18,20 and 22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 19,21,23 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 7,8,12, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook et al. (US 6,005,884) in view of Mano et al (US 5,319,700).

Regarding claim 7, Cook teaches of a method for wireless communication, comprising: a) positioning a plurality of slave transceivers within an enclosed region (Figure 1 and column 1, lines 44 – 57), at least one of the slave transceivers comprising a slave central processing unit (slave-CPU), at least one of the slave-CPUs being a controlling slave-CPUs adapted to control an adjustable operational parameter of the slave transceiver that comprises the controlling slave-CPU (Figure 5 and column 22, lines 7 – 23); b) receiving, within one of the plurality of slave transceivers, a reverse radio frequency (RF) signal (Figures 1 and 5 and column 9, lines 18 – 33 and column 22, lines 7 – 23); and c) controlling, in the receiving slave transceiver, the adjustable operational parameter of the receiving slave transceiver in response to a characteristic of the reverse RF signal (Figures 1 and 5 and column 22, lines 7 – 23). Note that cook's method occurs in a wireless cellular system (Cook see especially figs 8C, 8D, col 30, lines 60-65, col 31, lines 9-15, col 35, lines 52-56). Cook lacks a teaching of the arrangement being used for telephone signals. Note that Cook teaches the half duplex arrangement being used with ISDN networks (Cook see especially col 4, lines 33-60, col 35, lines 35-45). Mano teaches an adaptor for allowing telephone signals to be sent over a half duplex ISDN connection (Mano see especially fig 2, col 4, lines 45-65). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Cook to use the adapter taught by Mano in order to allow the system to be used with telephone signals.

Regarding claim 8, Cook teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 7. Cook further teaches of wherein the adjustable operation parameter is the gain of an amplifier within the slave transceiver (column 21, lines 44 – 57 and column 22, lines 7 – 23).

Regarding claim 12, Cook teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 7. Cook further teaches of comprising: a) receiving an instruction in a slave-CPUs from a management unit (column 19, lines 41 – 58); b) in the receiving slave-CPU, setting at least one adjustable operational parameter of the slave transceivers comprising the receiving slave-CPU to initial values in response to the received instruction (column 19, lines 41 – 58 and column 22, lines 7 – 22).

As to claim 20, note that cook teaches a variable attenuator controlling the output power, which would of course have the effect of varying the coverage area (Cook, col 21, lines 5-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1, 3 – 6, 14, 15, 18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook et al in view of Mano and in view of Heiman et al. (US 6,002,918).

Consider claim 1, Cook in view of Mano teaches of an apparatus for wireless communication, comprising: a) a plurality of slave transceivers spatially separated from one another within an enclosed region (Figure 1 and column 1, lines 44 – 57), each of

the slave transceivers comprising an associated slave central processing unit (slave-CPU), each slave-CPU being adapted to control at least one adjustable operational parameter of its associated slave transceiver in response to at least one characteristic of a received reverse radio frequency (RF) signal (Figure 5 and column 22, lines 7 – 23), and each slave transceiver being adapted to: i) receive the reverse RF signal (Figures 1 and 5 and column 9, lines 18 – 33); ii) process the received RF signal based on at least one of the adjustable operational parameters (Figure 5 and column 22, lines 7 – 23); and iii) generate a reverse slave signal; and (column 9, lines 18 – 33) b) a master transceiver coupled the plurality of slave transceivers (Figure 1 and column 9, lines 34 – 43), the master transceiver being adapted to: i) convey setting signals to the plurality of slave transceivers so as to set the adjustable operational parameters thereof (column 19, lines 41 – 58); ii) receive and process the reverse slave signals from the plurality of slave transceivers, so as to generate corresponding reverse master signals (Figure 1 and column 10, lines 49 – 58 and column 9, lines 34 – 48); and iii) convey the reverse master signals to at least one [base station transceiver subsystem (BTS)] computer external to the region (Figure 1 and column 9, lines 13 – 18). Cook in view of Mano does not specifically teach of one base station transceiver subsystem (BTS).

In a related art dealing with wireless local area networks, Heiman teaches of a base station transceiver (column 2, lines 49 – 55). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Cook in view of Mano's repeater system, Heiman's computer functioning as a base station transceiver, for the purposes of allowing improved selection by a mobile to an access point (or base station,

as Cook states the two are the same in column 1, lines 28 – 32) for communication when in the access point's coverage, as taught by Heiman.

As to claim 3, Cook in view of Mano and in view of Heiman, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 1. Cook in view of Mano further teaches of further comprising a management unit adapted to convey instructions to the plurality of slave-CPUs to set at least one of the adjustable operational parameters of at least one of the slave transceivers to initial values (column 19, lines 45 – 58).

As to claim 4, Cook in view of Mano and in view of Heiman, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 3. Cook further teaches of wherein the master transceiver is coupled to the BTSs (Figure 1) and adapted to: b) generate corresponding forward master signals (column 19, lines 45 – 58 and column 10, lines 49 – 53); and c) convey the forward master signals to the plurality of slave transceivers (column 19, lines 45 – 58); and wherein each slave transceiver is adapted to: a) receive the forward master signals (column 19, lines 45 – 58); and b) generate corresponding forward slave RF signals (column 19, lines 45 – 58 and column 20 , lines 1 – 10); and wherein each slave-CPU is adapted to: a) monitor the generated forward slave signals (column 19, lines 45 – 58 and starting column 20, line 60 and ending column 21, line 4); b) to adjust at least one of the operational parameters from an initial value in response to the generated forward slave signals (column 19, lines 45 – 58 and starting column 20, line 60 and ending column 21, line 4 and column 22, lines 7 – 22). Cook in view of Mano does not specifically teach of a) receive and process forward RF signals from the BTSs (note Cook makes provisions of using an alternate form of link for the LAN or WAN

backbone in column 13, lines 4 – 7). In a related art, Heiman teaches of a) receive and process forward RF signals from the BTSs (column 1, lines 28 – 40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention, to have replaced Cook in view of Mano's wired local area communications link with Heiman's wireless local area communications link, for the purposes of added mobility and elimination of no coverage areas, as taught by Heiman.

As to claim 5, Cook in view of Mano and in view of Heiman, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 4. Cook further teaches of wherein the slave-CPU is further adapted to adjust at least one of the operational parameters from an initial value in response to the generated reverse slave signals (column 19, lines 45 – 58 and column 22, lines 7 – 22).

As to claims 6 and 14, Cook in view of Mano and in view of Heiman, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claims 4 and 13. Cook further teaches of wherein the master transceiver comprises a master-CPU which is adapted to monitor at least some of the slave-CPUs (column 19, lines 45 – 58) and, in response to the slave-CPUs and to initial instructions received from the management unit, to vary at least one of a group comprising a number of BTSs communicating with the master transceiver and at least one channel parameter of each BTS (column 10, lines 59 – 64).

As to claim 15, Cook in view of Mano teaches of an apparatus for wireless communication, comprising: a) a first plurality of slave transceivers which are spatially separated from one another within an enclosed region (Figure 1 and column 1, lines 44 – 57), each of which slave transceivers is adapted to receive a reverse radio frequency

(RF) signal generated by a mobile transceiver within the region (Figure 1 and column 9, lines 8 -17) and to process the RF signal, based on at least one adjustable operational parameter, so as to generate a reverse slave signal (column 22, lines 7 – 23), each of the slave transceivers comprising an associated slave central processing unit (slave-CPU) which is adapted to control at least one of the adjustable operational parameters of the slave-CPU's associated slave transceiver in response to at least one characteristics of the reverse RF signal (column 22, lines 7 – 23); and b) a second plurality of master transceivers, which are coupled to receive and process the reverse slave signals from the first plurality of slave transceivers so as to generate corresponding reverse master signals (Figures 1 – 3 and column 9, lines 25 – 39), and to convey the reverse master signals to a third plurality of computers [base station transceiver subsystems (BTSs)] external to the region (Figures 1 –3 and column 9, lines 34 –48), and which are adapted to convey setting signals to the first plurality of slave transceivers so as to set the adjustable operational parameters thereof (column 10, lines 49 –58). Cook does not specifically teach of base station transceiver subsystems (BTSs). In a related art dealing with wireless local area networks, Heiman teaches of base station transceiver subsystems (BTSs) (column 2, lines 49 –55). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Cook in view of Mano's repeater system, Heiman's computer functioning as a base station transceiver, for the purposes of allowing improved selection by a mobile to an access point (or base station, as Cook states the two are the same in column 1, lines 28 – 32) for communication when in the access point's coverage, as taught by Heiman.

As to claims 18,22 note that cook teaches a variable attenuator controlling the output power, which would of course have the effect of varying the coverage area (Cook, col 21, lines 5-20).

3. Claims 2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Mano et al. or Cook et al in view of Mano and in view of Heiman et al. as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, respectively, and further in view of Ames (Ames, US Patent No. 5,233,626).

Regarding claims 2 and 11, Cook in view of Mano in view of Heiman, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claims 1 and 7. Cook further teaches of diversity antennas (starting column 28, line 66 and ending column 29 line 10). Cook in view of Mano in view of Heiman do not specifically teach of wherein the plurality of slave transceivers comprises at least one diversity transceiver and at least one main transceiver, wherein the RF signals received by the diversity transceivers are substantially different from the RF signal received by the main transceivers. In a related art dealing with spread spectrum receivers in repeaters, Ames teaches of wherein the plurality of slave transceivers comprises at least one diversity transceiver and at least one main transceiver, wherein the RF signals received by the diversity transceivers are substantially different from the RF signal received by the main transceivers (Figure 2 and column 4, lines 51 – 56). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Cook in view of Mano and Heiman's repeater system, Ames' diversity receivers, for the purposes of mitigating

multi-path interference (especially as the system is indoor) and thus improving performance, as taught by Ames.

4. Claim 9, 10, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Mano et al. as applied to claim 7 and 12 above, and further in view of Heiman et al. (Heiman, US Patent No. 6,002,918).

Regarding claim 9, Cook in view of Mano teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 7. Cook further teaches of further comprising; a) generating an alternative frequency (AF) reverse slave signal in the receiving slave transceiver in response to the reverse RF signal (Figures 2 and 3 and column 14, line 42 – 56); b) receiving the AF reverse slave signal in a master transceiver (Figure 2 and 3, column 15, lines 15 – 33); c) in the receiving master transceiver in which the reverse slave signals were received frequency converting the received AF reverse slave signal to an RF reverse master signal (Figure 3 and column 16, lines 52 – 60); d) conveying the reverse master signal to a computer [base station transceiver subsystem (BTS)] external to the region (Figures 2 and 3 and starting column 18, line 63 and ending column 19, line 8). Cook does not specifically teach of to base station transceiver subsystem (BTS) (note Cook makes provisions of using an alternate form of link for the LAN or WAN backbone in column 13, lines 4 – 7). In a related art dealing with wireless local area networks, Heiman teaches of a base station transceiver (column 2, lines 49 – 55). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Cook in view of Mano's repeater system, Heiman's computer functioning as a base station transceiver, for the purposes of allowing improved selection by a

mobile to an access point (or base station, as Cook states the two are the same in column 1, lines 28 – 32) for communication when in the access point's coverage, as taught by Heiman.

As to claim 10, Cook in view of Mano in view of Heiman, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 9. Cook further teaches of comprising; a) conveying a setting signal from the receiving master transceiver to the receiving slave transceiver; (column 19, lines 41 – 58 and starting column 20, line 60 and ending column 21, line 4 and column 22, line 7 – 23) and b) in response to the conveyed setting signal, adjusting, at least one operational parameter of the receiving slave transceiver (column 19, lines 41 – 58 and starting column 20, line 60 and ending column 21, line 4 and column 22, line 7 – 23).

As to claim 13, Cook in view of Mano teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Cook further teaches of comprising: b) generating forward master AF signals [in response to the received forward master RF signals] (Figures 1 – 3 and column 10, lines 49 – 53 and column 19, lines 45 – 58) conveying the forward master signals to the plurality of slave transceivers (Figure 1 –3 and column 19, lines 45 – 58), d) in the plurality of slave transceivers, receiving the forward master AF signals (Figure 1 –3 and 5 and column 19, lines 45 – 58); e) in the plurality of slave transceivers, generating forward slave RF signals in response to the received forward master AF signals (Figure 1 –3 and 5 and column 19, lines 45 – 58 and column 20 , lines 1 – 10); f) monitoring the corresponding forward slave RF signals in each of the slave transceivers (column 19, lines 45 -58 and starting column 20, line 60 and ending

column 21, line 4); and g) varying at least one of the operational parameters of each of the slave transceivers from their initial values, in response to the forward slave RF signals and reverse slave RF signals (column 19, lines 45 -58 and starting column 20, line 60 and ending column 21, line 4 and column 22, lines 7 – 22). Cook does not specifically teach of receiving in the forward master RF signals from the BTS (note Cook makes provisions of using an alternate form of link for the LAN or WAN backbone in column 13, lines 4 – 7). In a related art, Heiman teaches of receiving in the forward master RF signals from the BTS (column 1, lines 28 – 40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention, to have replaced Cook in view of Mano's wired local area communications link with Heiman's wireless local area communications link, for the purposes of added mobility and elimination of no coverage areas, as taught by Heiman.

5. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Mano et al. (Cook, US Patent No. 6,005,884) in view of Heiman et al. (Heiman, US Patent No. 6,002,918) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Brozovich et al. (Brozovich, US Patent No. 5,661,434).

Regarding claim 16, Cook in view of Mano in view Heiman; teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 15. Cook further teaches of communicates with at least one of the third plurality of BTSSs (column 9, lines 44 – 48) and a master-CPU (column 19, lines 45 – 54). Cook in view of Heiman do not specifically teach of wherein each of the master transceivers comprises a switch and a third plurality of gain elements and wherein the master-CPU of each master transceiver is adapted to operate the switch

and the third plurality of gain elements of the associated master transceiver so that the associated master transceiver communicates via the third plurality of gain elements.

In a related art dealing with wireless local area network amplifiers, Brozovich teaches of wherein each of the master transceivers comprises a switch and a third plurality of gain elements (Figures 2A and 2B and starting column 1, line 63 and ending column 2, line 10) and wherein the master-CPU of each master transceiver is adapted to operate the switch and the third plurality of gain elements of the associated master transceiver so that the associated master transceiver communicates via the third plurality of gain elements (Figures 2A and 2B and starting column 1, line 63 and ending column 2, line 10). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Cook in view of Mano and Heiman's repeater system, Brozovich's switched amplifiers, for the purposes of higher efficiency amplification, thus resulting in prolonged battery life, as taught by Brozovich.

As to claim 17, Cook in view of Mano, in view of Heiman and Brozovich, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 16. Cook further teaches of wherein each of the master transceivers is adapted to adjust a bandwidth of at least some of the slave transceivers responsive to the number of BTSs being communicated (column 16, lines 37 – 51) and Brozovich further teaches of with via the third plurality of gain elements (Figures 2A and 2B and starting column 1, line 63 and ending column 2, line 10).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 19,21, and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Consider claims 19,21,23, the nearest prior art as shown in Cook fails to teach the method or apparatus shown in claims 18,20, or 22 wherein the at least one slave CPU varies the size of the coverage area responsive to instructions received from one of the following: the at least one slave CPU associated with the slave transceiver independent of the master transceiver; the at least one slave CPU associated with the slave transceiver in combination with the master transceiver; and the master transceiver independent of the at least one slave CPU associated with the slave transceiver.

Response to Amendment

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18, 20, and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. Applicant argues that Cook teaches away from use with telephone signals. In fact Cook merely teaches that the arrangement differs from the conventional telephone arrangement, this is entirely different from teaching that the arrangement should not be used with conventional telephone signals. Cook does note that it is conventional for telephone signals to be used with full duplex signaling. However the problem of telephone signaling using half duplex arrangements such as Cook's has been overcome, as shown in the newly cited art above.

Conclusion

9. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J Sobutka whose telephone number is 571-272-7887. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am - 5:00pm.
12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882.
13. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

On July 15, 2005, the Central FAX Number will change to **571-273-8300**. This new Central FAX Number is the result of relocating the Central FAX server to the Office's Alexandria, Virginia campus.

Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number. To give customers time to adjust to the new Central FAX Number, faxes sent to the old number (703-872-9306) will be routed to the new number until September 15, 2005. After September 15, 2005, the old number will no longer be in service and **571-273-8300** will be the only facsimile number recognized for "centralized delivery".

CENTRALIZED DELIVERY POLICY: For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), and facsimile transmissions must be sent to the Central FAX number, unless an exception applies. For example, if the examiner has rejected claims in a regular U.S. patent application, and the reply to the examiner's Office action is desired to be transmitted by facsimile rather than mailed, the reply must be sent to the Central FAX Number.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Philip Sobutka


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 09/775,894

Art Unit: 2684

Page 16

(571) 272-7887